REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 16-36, 38-57 and 59-65 are pending. Claims 1 and 65 are amended. New claims 66-67 are added.

Claim 1 and 65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The claims are amended to obviate the rejection.

The pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Seifried et al. (U.S. 5,531,003, hereinafter "Seifried") in view of Stevenson et al. (U.S. 6,159,560 hereinafter "Stevenson"), and further in view of Dahlberg et al. (U.S. 5,245,999). Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 1 includes "a first connector for electrically coupling and mechanically engaging said first end with said first electrical contact." Seifried discloses feedthrough conductor pins provided with a thin metal coating to control oxidation growth. Stevenson discloses a process for depositing a silver coating on a metallic component of a feedthrough assembly. Dahlberg discloses a feedthrough for an implantable apparatus which includes conductors running through an insulating compound and sleeve. None of the cited references teach or suggest a connector for electrically coupling and mechanically engaging a conductive metal coating covering the first end of the terminal extending through the ferrule.

The Examiner stated that, "[a]Ithough not explicit, a first connector for electrically coupling and mechanically engaging the first end of terminal with an first electrical contact coupled to the electrical components of the IPG is necessarily present." Applicant respectfully disagrees. As the Examiner states, Seifried is silent as to the type of connector. Electrical connections can be made between an electrical contact and a feedthrough terminal without providing a connector that mechanically engages the terminal. For example, an electrical connection may be made with a conductive adhesive or a metallurgical joint (e.g., solder). The Examiner further asserts that the Applicant admits crimping and spring devices are both well known in the art for ensuring an electrical connection between terminal pins and electrical contacts. Applicant again disagrees. The Applicant stated on page 9 that "[m]any known crimping devices can be used in

place of the simple crimping mechanism 32 depicted in FIG. 4" and "[t]he spring device 36 shown in FIG. 5 is just one of many known spring devices that can be used according to the present invention." While the applicant has indicated known crimping devices and spring devices exist, the Applicant has not stated that crimping and spring devices are well known for ensuring an electrical connection between the feedthrough terminal pin and the electrical contact. To the contrary, none of the cited references teach or suggest the use of connectors for mechanically engaging the terminal end. With respect to claim 22, the Examiner states Seifried discloses that the feedthrough assembly is necessarily manufactured according to the method of claim 22. Seifried is silent with regard to how a connection is made between a feedthrough terminal and an electrical contact. A connection may be made using a conductive adhesive or a metallurgical joint. Such connections do not include "electrically coupling and mechanically engaging said first end of said terminal with said first electrical contact using a first connector" as stated in claim 22.

Finally, Applicants challenge the motivation to combine Seifried, Stevenson and Dahlberg. One aspect of the present invention sought to address the following situation:

Even though feedthroughs are typically manufactured in an inert atmosphere, high temperatures will encourage oxidation if there is residual oxygen from a sealing gas or from dissociation of surface adsorbed water on fixtures and components. Oxidation of the terminal affects the conductivity of the pin lead and its ability to make good electrical connections with other elements. The ability for the surface oxidized pin terminal to be electrically connected to a contact would be particularly impaired if mechanical means such as crimping were employed to establish an electrical connection. This impairment is troublesome in cases where mechanical means might be less time consuming or less costly than other joining methods such as welding.

Application, p. 2. In contrast, Seifried addresses electromagnetic interference and Dahlberg provides a feedthrough and feedthrough structure that can be used in unipolar and bipolar pacemakers. A skilled artisan would not combine these references given the circumstances that the present inventor addressed.

Appl. No. 10/661,919 Reply to Office action of 05 11 2006 Page 16

Applicant respectfully asserts that the United States patent & Trademark Office (USPTO) used Applicant's patent application as a blue print and then engaged in reference-by-reference, limitation-by-limitation analysis to explain its motivation to combine references. The Federal Circuit prohibits such analysis, as explained in *In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 1000 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Withdrawal of the instant rejections and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

	Respectfully submitted,
August 2, 2006 Date	/Carol F. Barry/ Carol F. Barry Reg. No. 41,600 (763) 514-4673 Customer No. 27581